

**To:** Pldlof@usbr.gov[Pldlof@usbr.gov]; rin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]  
**Cc:** Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;Carolyn Yale/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;Laura Fujii/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;"Jewell, Michael S SPK" [Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil]; arolyn Yale/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;Laura Fujii/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;"Jewell, Michael S SPK" [Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil]; aura Fujii/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;"Jewell, Michael S SPK" [Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil]; Jewell, Michael S SPK" [Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil]; FBarajas@usbr.gov>[]  
**From:** "Nepstad, Michael G SPK"  
**Sent:** Mon 5/16/2011 6:53:24 PM  
**Subject:** RE: BDCP  
[image002.gif](#)  
[smime.p7s](#)  
<http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>  
<http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/organizations/cespk-co/regulatory/index.html>  
[www.facebook.com/sacramentodistrict](http://www.facebook.com/sacramentodistrict)  
[www.youtube.com/sacramentodistrict](http://www.youtube.com/sacramentodistrict)  
[www.twitter.com/USACESacramento](http://www.twitter.com/USACESacramento)  
<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>  
<mailto:Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov>  
<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>  
<http://bdcppweb.com/Files/Highlights of the BDCP FINAL 03-17-11.pdf>  
[pidlof@usbr.gov](mailto:pidlof@usbr.gov)

Thanks.

Just a quick comment: The way the alternatives are presented it seems as though a specific alteration of the Yolo bypass is integral to a specific configuration of the new conveyance and operations. If this is the case, you would need to get them all permitted at the same time, i.e, the Yolo bypass modifications could not be permitted separately from the intakes as they were both components of the same project.

I thought that is worth mentioning as I understood the current plan by the water contractors was that the intakes would be permitted first and the Yolo bypass later on.

Michael G. Nepstad

Deputy Chief, Regulatory Division

US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-200

Sacramento, California 95814

(916) 557-7262 Fax:(916) 557-6877

michael.g.nepstad@usace.army.mil

\* We want your feedback! Take the survey: <http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>

\* Need information on the Regulatory Program? Visit our website:  
<http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/organizations/cespk-co/regulatory/index.html>

\* Facebook: [www.facebook.com/sacramentodistrict](http://www.facebook.com/sacramentodistrict)

\* YouTube: [www.youtube.com/sacramentodistrict](http://www.youtube.com/sacramentodistrict)

\* Twitter: [www.twitter.com/USACESacramento](http://www.twitter.com/USACESacramento)

From: Idlof, Patricia S [mailto:Pidlof@usbr.gov]  
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2011 11:00 AM  
To: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov; Nepstad, Michael G SPK  
Cc: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov; Yale.Carolyn@epamail.epa.gov; Fujii.Laura@epamail.epa.gov; Jewell, Michael S SPK; Barajas, Federico  
Subject: RE: BDCP

All,

Per your request, attached are the detailed descriptions of the operations modeling for the existing BDCP EIR/EIS Alternatives 1-5.

Patti Idlof

916-992-3566 (c)

pidlof@usbr.gov

Reclamation BCLogo Bluesm

From: Idlof, Patricia S  
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2011 2:20 PM  
To: 'Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov'  
Cc: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov; Yale.Carolyn@epamail.epa.gov; Fujii.Laura@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: RE: BDCP

That's odd that the attachments we're included because I distinctly remember doing it. Sorry! Anyway, here they are. I'll work on getting the operational descriptions for the existing alternatives to forward on.

Patti Idlof

916-992-3566 (c)

pidlof@usbr.gov

Reclamation BCLogo Bluesm

From: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2011 2:09 PM  
To: Idlof, Patricia S  
Cc: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov; Yale.Carolyn@epamail.epa.gov; Fujii.Laura@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: RE: BDCP

Hi Patti,  
Thanks for the conf.call. I didn't notice at the time but when we mentioned this email exchange I went back and checked the messages and discovered the attachments you reference below weren't attached. If you could send those and the descriptions of operations for the five alternatives, it would be very helpful.

Thanks and have a good weekend,  
Erin

\*\*\*\*\*

Erin Foresman  
Environmental Scientist & Policy Coordinator,  
US EPA Region 9 C/O Army Corps of Engineers  
650 Capitol Mall Suite 5-200, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 557 5253, Fax: (916) 557 6877

<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>

From:

"Idlof, Patricia S" <Pidlof@usbr.gov>

To:

Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc:

Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

04/27/2011 04:04 PM

Subject:

RE: BDCP

Erin,

Attached is the description of the BDCP Proposed Project operational criteria (2/11/10 BDCP Handout) noted in the powerpoint. There are internal working draft descriptions of the alternatives that the consultants have developed, but they have not yet been reviewed and commented on by the lead agencies. Likely because no final decision has been made on the alternatives and due to the consultant work stoppage. The 2010 Proposed Project did not include a fall X2 action. As noted in the table, Alt 3 does include fall X2, but I don't recall if Alt 4 or Alt 5 included one or not.

Also attached is a draft non-federal cooperating MOU that was ultimately signed by the Federal lead agencies and Contra Costa County that you requested.

Patti Idlof  
916-992-3566 (c)  
pidlof@usbr.gov

From: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2011 1:39 PM  
To: Idlof, Patricia S  
Cc: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: RE: BDCP

Hi Patti,

Thanks for sending this to us! Is this the only description of range of alternatives that you know of? In the table near the end of the power point, in the operations column, there is mention of a document handed out at the 2-11-10 meeting that discusses the proposed bdcp project with respect to operations. I'm sorry to ask for another thing, but do you have a copy of that or could get a copy of that description?

Was there any development of "fall X2" as an operational criteria?

\*\*\*\*\*

Erin Foresman  
Environmental Scientist & Policy Coordinator,  
US EPA Region 9 C/O Army Corps of Engineers  
650 Capitol Mall Suite 5-200, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 557 5253, Fax: (916) 557 6877

<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>

-----"Idlof, Patricia S" <Pidlof@usbr.gov> wrote: -----

To: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: "Idlof, Patricia S" <Pidlof@usbr.gov>  
Date: 04/27/2011 12:00PM  
cc: Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject: RE: BDCP  
Karen and Erin,

Attached is the powerpoint presentation from the June 15, 2010 BECT meeting regarding the screening process and range of alternatives. I checked the BECT meeting list and several people from EPA and the Corps were included in the invitation. The EIR/EIS consultant seemed to recall that someone from EPA joined the meeting by phone and was emailed the presentation. In any case, this is it.

Looking forward to our continuing discussions.

Patti Idlof  
916-992-3566 (c)  
pidlof@usbr.gov

From: Idlof, Patricia S  
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2011 1:11 PM  
To: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov  
Cc: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: RE: BDCP

Hi Karen,  
I agree that our meeting last Friday was very productive and I'm looking forward to having more of them. I too had trouble finding the presentation given at our last BECT meeting (June 15, 2010) regarding the screening process, criteria, and resultant preliminary array of alternatives, so I've asked the consultant to track it down for me. I looked through some of my meeting notes and recalled that a presentation on this was also given at a Steering Committee meeting. A brief description and table of the preliminary array of alternatives is included in the state's BDCP Highlights document on pages 74-76 (see link).

[http://bdcweb.com/Files/Highlights\\_of\\_the\\_BDCP\\_FINAL\\_03-17-11.pdf](http://bdcweb.com/Files/Highlights_of_the_BDCP_FINAL_03-17-11.pdf)

Yes, I believe that's what I said at last Thursday's meeting. What I was addressing was that the alternatives need to at least partially satisfy the P&N, or they wouldn't be included for analysis. A "reduced export alternative" would be difficult to define (how much reduced? reduced from what?) and wouldn't meet the co-equal goals of the project. That doesn't mean that one or more alternatives would not result in reduced exports (which some actually do).

The results of the screening process will be described in the alternatives development report, an appendix to the EIR/EIS which has not been completed. So I don't have a detailed writeup to forward you at this point.

Hope this helps!

Patti Idlof  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Mid-Pacific Region, MP-152  
916-992-3566 (c)  
pidlof@usbr.gov

From: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov [Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 3:31 PM  
To: Idlof, Patricia S  
Cc: Nawi, David  
Subject: BDCP  
Hi Patti -

I heard that Friday's meeting on 404 integration was productive - thanks for organizing it.

I wanted to get clarification on what I think I heard on last Thursday's federal agency call. It was in the context of discussing the State Board's recent letter about the need for a "reduced export" alternative. I think I heard you say that this could be a problem for the federal DEIS as the Screening Criteria had screened out (or would screen out) such an alternative. Did I get that right? You were going to send me the Screening Criteria because somehow I had missed that this document had been completed. Is there also a report documenting the results of applying this criteria? Or was that what you said was done by powerpoint at a BECT meeting?

Thanks Patti! - Karen

~~~~~  
KAREN SCHWINN  
Associate Director  
Water Division  
U.S. EPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street (Wtr-1)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415/972-3472  
415/297-5509 (mobile)  
415/947-3537 (fax)  
~~~~~

[attachment "Presentation for Range of Alternatives for June 15 2010 BECT v5.pptx" removed by Erin  
Foresman/R9/USEPA/US]

\*\*\*\*\* ATTACHMENT NOT DELIVERED \*\*\*\*\*

This Email message contained an attachment named  
image001.jpg  
which may be a computer program. This attached computer program could  
contain a computer virus which could cause harm to EPA's computers,  
network, and data. The attachment has been deleted.

This was done to limit the distribution of computer viruses introduced  
into the EPA network. EPA is deleting all computer program attachments  
sent from the Internet into the agency via Email.

If the message sender is known and the attachment was legitimate, you  
should contact the sender and request that they rename the file name  
extension and resend the Email with the renamed attachment. After  
receiving the revised Email, containing the renamed attachment, you can  
rename the file extension to its correct name.

For further information, please contact the EPA Call Center at  
(866) 411-4EPA (4372). The TDD number is (866) 489-4900.

\*\*\*\*\* ATTACHMENT NOT DELIVERED \*\*\*\*\*